

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-8, and 15-26 are pending. Claims 1, 15, and 17 are amended. The remaining claims are unchanged.

The claim amendments are supported by the application as originally filed, for example, in paragraphs [0147]-[0160] of the published application, Pub No. 2003/0018808. No new matter has been added.

Interview Summary

Applicant's attorney thanks the Examiner for discussing the application in a telephone interview on July 23, 2009. In the interview, the feature of an identifier was discussed. The Examiner suggested amending the claims to clarify the distinction between an identifier and a device address. Applicant's attorney appreciates the Examiner's suggestion in this regard, and the claims have been amended accordingly.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Zombek et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,704,768 (hereinafter "Zombek").

It is respectfully submitted that claims 17-20 are not anticipated for at least the following reasons.

By way of example, claim 17 is directed to a method for authenticating services participating in routing of a message in a message routing network. Claim 17 has been amended to recite:

before the routing of the message in the message routing network:

(a) authenticating an enterprise to the message routing network;

(b) associating an identifier with the enterprise, the identifier provided by the message routing network responsive to authentication of the enterprise to the message routing network, the identifier indicating authentication of the enterprise to the message routing network;

(c) authenticating the enterprise to a first service provider;

(d) associating the identifier with an account of the enterprise at the first service provider responsive to the enterprise being authenticated to the first service provider, such that the identifier further indicates authentication of the enterprise to the enterprise's account at the first service provider;

such that when a message including said identifier is received from a sender of the message, **authentication of only said message routing network by a receiver of said message using the identifier included in the message provides authentication of the sender of the message.**

(Emphasis Added).

Claim 17 has been amended to clarify that the identifier is provided by the message routing network responsive to authentication of the enterprise to the message routing network. Thus, as recited in newly amended claim 17, “the identifier indicat[es] authentication of the enterprise to the message routing network.” Thus, “when a message including said identifier is received from a sender of the message, authentication of only said message routing network by a receiver of said message using the identifier included in the message provides authentication ...”

Zombek fails to disclose or suggest authentication of only the message routing network using an identifier as defined in claim 17. In contrast, Zombek describes authorization using an individual device address of a device associated with the message. For instance, Zombek teaches a message router that “can check the device address against a local cache of authorized devices 112.” (Col. 21, lines 39-41). Such a device address is described in Zombek as, for example, an “IP address or Mobitex MAN number.” (Col. 21, line 36). There is no disclosure or suggestion in Zombek that the device address also “indicat[es] authentication of the enterprise to the message routing network,” as recited in claim 17. Without any teaching in this regard, Applicant respectfully submits that those skilled in the art would interpret the discussion of such addresses or numbers in Zombek to specify an addresses on a network, but not include additional information such as the authentication indications defined in claim 17.

Additionally, Zombek makes no mention of any authentication performed by the receiver of the message. Instead, Zombek states that “the MR 124 can be responsible for determining that the sender of a message is an authorized customer of the intelligent messaging network.” (Col. 21, lines 32-34). Nowhere does Zombek disclose or suggest that the receiver of a message authenticates the network. Zombek also makes no mention of including the device address in the message. Therefore, Zombek fails to disclose or suggest that “authentication of only said message routing network by a receiver of said message using the identifier included in the message provides authentication of the sender of the message,” as recited in claim 17.

Thus, claim 17 recites features that are not disclosed or suggested in Zombek. Therefore, claim 17 is not anticipated by Zombek.

Claims 18-20 are dependent claims which, by virtue of their dependency, incorporate the features of claim 17. Thus, claims 18-20 are not anticipated for at least the reasons set forth above.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 and 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of Zombek and Shiozawa, U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2001/0005358 (hereinafter “Shiozawa”). Claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of Zombek and Giroux, U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0243574 (hereinafter “Giroux”). Claims 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of Zombek and Sandhu et al., U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2008/0052775 (hereinafter “Sandhu”).

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3, 5-8, 15-16, and 21-26 are not obvious for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1 and 15 have been amended to recite features similar to those recited in claim 17. As discussed herein, Zombek fails to disclose or suggest several features recited in claim 17 as amended. Shiozawa, Giroux, and Sandhu are not cited in the Office Action as disclosing or suggesting any of the features discussed above with respect to claim 17.

Thus, claims 1 and 15 recite features that are not disclosed or suggested in Zombek, Shiozawa, and Giroux, considered alone or in combination. Therefore, claims 1 and 15 are not obvious in view of Zombek, Shiozawa, and Giroux.

Claims 2-3, 5-8, 16, and 21-26 are dependent claims which, by virtue of their dependency, incorporate the features of the independent claims on which they are based. Therefore, claims 2-3, 5-8, 16, and 21-26 are not obvious for at least the reasons set forth above.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 1-3, 5-8, 15-16, and 21-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, allowance of the claims at the earliest possible date is requested.

If prosecution of this application can be assisted by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number set forth below.

Applicant does not believe that any additional fees are required to facilitate the filing of this Amendment. However, if it is determined that such fees are due, please charge such additional fees to Deposit Account No. 504480 (Order No. ODVFP009A).

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

/John F. Griffith/

John F. Griffith
Reg. No. 44,137

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100